

I. Recommendation

APPROVE

Overall the application is complete and adequate; and during their Capacity Interview, the applicant(s) demonstrated a clear capacity to implement the academic, organizational and financial management plans as described in the application. Nothing was identified that would indicate the applicant(s) do not have the experience, knowledge, and competence to successfully open and operate a charter school.

APPROVE WITH CONDITIONS

Overall the application is complete and adequate; and during their Capacity Interview, the applicant(s) demonstrated a general capacity to implement the academic, organizational and financial management plans as described in the application. However, the PED has identified some specific concerns that would need to be addressed during the planning year. The PED has listed the noted concerns and conditions to address the concerns below. If the PEC determines that there are any additional conditions that need to be addressed, those should be noted during the public hearing and all approved conditions negotiated in the final contract.

PROPOSED CONDITIONS

DENY


Overall the application is either incomplete or inadequate; or during their Capacity Interview, the applicant(s) did not sufficiently demonstrate the experience, knowledge, and competence to successfully open and operate a charter school.

The Charter Schools Act, in paragraph 1 of Subsection L of Section 22-8B-6 NMSA 1978, states that a chartering authority may approve, approve with conditions or deny an application. A chartering authority may deny an application if:

- (1) the application is incomplete or inadequate;
- (2) the application does not propose to offer an educational program consistent with the requirements and purposes of the Charter Schools Act;
- (3) the proposed head administrator or other administrative or fiscal staff was involved with another charter school whose charter was denied or revoked for fiscal management or the proposed head administrator or other administrative or fiscal staff was discharged from a public school for fiscal mismanagement;

-
- (4) for a proposed state-chartered charter school, it does not request to have the governing body of the charter school designated as a board of finance or the governing body does not qualify as a board of finance; or
 - (5) the application is otherwise contrary to the best interests of the charter school's projected students, the local community or the school district in whose geographic boundaries the charter school applies to operate.

**NEW MEXICO PUBLIC EDUCATION DEPARTMENT
OPTIONS FOR PARENTS AND FAMILIES DIVISION**

By: 

Katie Poulos, Director

I. Overall Score Sheet

Section	Points Received	Applicant School's Possible Points
Application Overall Score	275	287
• Education Plan/Academic Framework	82	84
• Organizational Plan and Governance/Organizational Framework	135*	131*
• Business Plan/ Financial Framework	34	44
• Evidence of Support	24	24
Capacity Interview Overall Score	92	92
Overall Score – Application and Capacity Interview	367	379

*Points earned for the "Organizational Plan" is higher than total points possible because the Food Services points were awarded as "Preference points." Preference points are awarded because the applicant school plans to participate in the NSLP.

II. Explanation Regarding Use of the Score Sheet

In the Recommendation and Final Analysis, the PED has considered the overall score in the written application, responses provided during the Capacity Interview, feedback expressed at the Community Input Hearing on July 20, 2017, as well as information obtained from the letters of support or opposition received after the Community Input Hearing.

Also note two additional considerations:

- First, the PED does not score the community input hearing, but may reference these in the Recommendation and Final Analysis if pertinent information was offered that contradicts or affirms what was found in the application.
- Second, if the applicant school did not answer any prompt (question) because that prompt did not apply to the applicant school (e.g., the applicant school will be an elementary school and so did not provide responses to graduation-related prompts), then the PED adjusted the total possible points in the application section where the non-applicable item(s) is found as well as in the final score. For this reason, you may see varying possible total points from application to application.

III. Final Analysis

Application Section	Points Received	Applicant School's Possible Points
EDUCATION PLAN/ACADEMIC FRAMEWORK	82	84
<p>Evidence/Statements Supporting Score in this Section:</p> <p>The application review team found this section to be complete and adequate. The applicant scored “<i>Meets the Criteria</i>” in all but one area. One (1) area was scored “<i>Approaches the Criteria</i>” for the following reason.</p> <p>According to evaluators, with respect to the application:</p> <p>The narrative did not sufficiently describe how the school will “<i>identify and provide instructional supports</i>” to gifted students and how the school “<i>will address the spectrum of needs that students with IEPs may present.</i>”</p> <p><u>Overall, this section of the application is adequate as nearly 100% of the responses were rated “<i>Meets the Criteria,</i>” no more than 3 areas were rated “<i>Approaches the Criteria,</i>” and no area was rated “<i>Falls Far Below the Criteria.</i>” The application earned 97.6% of possible points.</u></p> <p>During the Capacity Interview, the evaluators asked Question 18 regarding how the school would support students more severe disabilities.</p> <p>According to the evaluators: “Ultimately, they believe that a general education in the classroom is ideal, however the 2-teacher model allows for flexibility in the instructional schedule to suit the needs of the students and their families.”</p> <p><u>The review team determined that the response provided by the school adequately addressed the concern. The school received the full points (4) for this question.</u></p>		

Application Section	Points Received	Applicant School's Possible Points
ORGANIZATIONAL PLAN AND GOVERNANCE / ORGANIZATIONAL FRAMEWORK	135	131
<p>Evidence/Statements Supporting Score in this Section:</p> <p>The application review team found this section to be complete and adequate. The applicant scored “<i>Meets the Criteria</i>” in all areas and earned “<i>Preference points</i>” for planning to participate in the National School Lunch Program (NSLP).</p> <p><u>Overall, this section of the application is adequate as 100% of the responses were rated “<i>Meets the Criteria</i>” with additional points awarded for planning participation in the NSLP.</u></p>		

Application Section	Points Received	Applicant School's Possible Points
BUSINESS PLAN/ FINANCIAL FRAMEWORK	34	44
<p>Evidence/Statements Supporting Score in this Section:</p> <p>The application review team found this section to be complete and adequate. The applicant scored “<i>Meets the Criteria</i>” in all but three areas of the section which were scored “<i>Approaches the Criteria</i>” for the following reason.</p> <p>According to evaluators:</p> <p>B.(2) “<i>Most areas of the budget align with the school’s mission and the educational program for the next five years with the exception of the staffing model for instructional staff. The budget does not include a sufficient number of teachers to implement the two-teacher model in the primary grades.</i>”</p> <p>B.(3) “<i>As stated in the budget plan section B(2) of the application, the number of teachers included in the budget and assumptions does not seem sufficient to implement the two-teacher model for students in grades K-2.</i>”</p> <p>B.(4) The applicant does not sufficiently—</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “<i>Address how special education students will receive services before special education funding is provided based on accurate 40 day counts;</i> • “<i>Address how gaps between budgeted students and actual enrollment will be addressed.</i>” <p><u>Overall, this section of the application is adequate as nearly 62.5% (5/8) of the responses were rated “<i>Meets the Criteria</i>,” no more than 3 areas were rated “<i>Approaches the Criteria</i>,” and no area was rated “<i>Falls Far Below the Criteria</i>.” The application earned 77.2% of possible points.</u></p> <p>During the Capacity Interview, the evaluators asked a series of several finance-related questions aimed at addressing the areas that were scored as “<i>Approaches the Criteria</i>” on the application. Questions 12-14 and 21-23 were specifically asked so that the school could provide clarity on these concerns.</p> <p>According to the evaluators:</p> <p>“The founding team understands that only reaching 50 percent of its enrollment target would have a “tremendous” impact on its business plans. However, they identified areas where adjustments may be made that would still align with its mission, to include: reducing material purchases, changing to a 1.5 teacher model, restructuring the salaries and having the administration take on additional roles to support the classrooms. They believe that by working closely with EdTec to readjust the budget to serve a lesser amount of students under a 1.5 teacher model will be a part of the board's strategy.”</p> <p><u>Thus, the review team determined that the responses provided by the school adequately addressed the concerns in the written application. The school received the full points (4) for each of the questions.</u></p>		

Application Section	Points Received	Applicant School's Possible Points
EVIDENCE OF SUPPORT	24	24

Evidence/Statements Supporting Score in this Section:

The PED found this section to be complete and adequate. The applicant scored *“Meets the Criteria”* in all areas in this section.

Overall, this section of the application is adequate as 100% of the responses were rated *“Meets the Criteria”* in which 100% of possible points were earned.

Other Pertinent Information

During the July, 20th community input hearing public 100% of public input was in support of the school. No opposition was raised by community members, including representatives from the local school district. The Public Education Commission raised concerns about the sustainability of the two-teacher model, but the school reiterated its belief in the importance and viability of the model.

Overall the application is complete and adequate; and during the capacity Interview and public input hearing, the applicant(s) demonstrated the capacity to implement the education and governance/management plans as described in the application.